

On locally LC -spaces*

Julian DONTCHEV, Maximilian GANSTER and Alev KANIBIR

Abstract

A topological space (X, τ) is called a locally LC -space if every point of X has a neighborhood U such that every Lindelöf subset of $(U, \tau|_U)$ is a closed subset of $(U, \tau|_U)$. The aim of this paper is to continue the study of locally LC -spaces.

1 Introduction

Classical generalizations of Lindelöf spaces such as hereditarily Lindelöf and maximal Lindelöf spaces have had their major impact in the development of General Topology. A certain class of spaces, relatively new as a concept but extensively studied in recent years, is the class of LC -spaces. A topological space (X, τ) whose Lindelöf subsets are closed is called an LC -space by Gauld, Mršević, Reilly and Vamanamurthy [7] and by Mukherji and Sarkar [9]. This concept emerged from the study of maximal Lindelöf spaces [1] as being a notion having a close relationship to P-spaces.

LC -spaces generalize Wilansky's KC-spaces [11] and Hausdorff P-spaces [10]. On the other hand every LC -space is a cid-space, i.e., all countable sets are closed and discrete, and hence T_1 and anti-compact (= pseudo-finite) [2]. An extensive list of references on LC -spaces as well as some generalizations of the concept can be found in [4].

Recently, Ganster, Kanibir and Reilly [6] introduced the class of locally LC -spaces. By definition, a topological space (X, τ) is called a *locally LC -space* if each point of X has a neighborhood which is an LC -subspace. In [6], the authors proved that a space (X, τ) is an LC -space if and only if each point of X has a closed neighborhood that is an LC -subspace.

*1991 Math. Subject Classification — Primary: 54D20, 54A05, Secondary: 54D45, 54G99.
Key words and phrases — LC -space, locally LC -space, Lindelöf set.

Thus every regular locally LC -space is an LC -space, a result first proved by Hdeib and Pareek in [8]. The following example shows that we cannot replace ‘regular’ by ‘Hausdorff’.

Example 1.1 [5, 6] There exists a Hausdorff, locally LC -space (X, τ) , which is not an LC -space. Let Z be a set of cardinality $\aleph_1$ with a distinguished point z_0 . The topology on Z is defined as follows: each $z \neq z_0$ is isolated while the basic neighborhoods of z_0 are the cocountable subsets of Z containing z_0 . Note that Z is a Lindelöf LC -space. The space (X, τ) will be constructed from copies of Z . For each $n \in \omega$, let X_n be a copy of Z , where x_n denotes the non-isolated point of X_n . Let $X^* = \sum_{n \in \omega} X_n$ denote the topological sum of the spaces X_n and let $X = X^* \cup \{p\}$ with $p \notin X^*$. A topology τ on X can be defined if, in addition, we specify the basic open neighborhoods of p . They are the union of $\{p\}$ and a cocountable subset of $\cup\{X_n \setminus \{x_n\}; n \geq k\}$ for some $k \in \omega$. (X, τ) is a Hausdorff space that fails to be an LC -space [5]. However, as shown in [6], (X, τ) is a locally LC -space.

2 Locally LC -spaces

Proposition 2.1 *For a topological space (X, τ) the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) X is a locally LC -spaces.
- (2) Every point of X has an open neighborhood, which is an LC -subspace of X .

Proof. Follows from the fact that every subspace of an LC -space is an LC -space. $\square$

Proposition 2.2 *Every subspace of a locally LC -space is a locally LC -space.*

Proof. Let (X, τ) be a locally LC -space and let $A \subseteq X$. By assumption, for each $x \in A$, there exists $U \in \tau$ such that $(U, \tau|U)$ is an LC -space. Note that $V = U \cap A$ is an open neighborhood of x in $(A, \tau|A)$ and that $(V, \tau|V)$ is an LC -subspace. By Proposition 2.1, $(A, \tau|A)$ is a locally LC -space. $\square$

Proposition 2.3 *If (X, τ) has an open cover by locally LC -subspaces, then X is a locally LC -space.*

Proof. Let $X = \cup_{i \in I} G_i$ be an open cover of X where each G_i is a locally LC -space, and let $x \in X$. Choose $j \in I$ such that $x \in G_j$. If U_j is an open neighborhood of x in G_j such that U_j is an LC -subspace of G_j , then U_j is also open in (X, τ) . By Proposition 2.1, (X, τ) is a locally LC -space. $\square$

Corollary 2.4 *Let $(X_\alpha, \tau_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Omega}$ be a family of topological spaces. For the topological sum $X = \sum_{\alpha \in \Omega} X_\alpha$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *X is a locally LC -space.*
- (2) *Each X_α is a locally LC -space.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3. $\square$

Proposition 2.5 *Let $(X_i, \tau_i)_{i \in F}$ be a finite family of Hausdorff spaces. If each X_i is a locally LC -space, then the product space $X = \prod_{i \in F} X_i$ is also a locally LC -space.*

Proof. Let (X, τ) and (Y, σ) be Hausdorff locally LC -spaces. Let $(x, y) \in X \times Y$. By assumption, there exists $U \in \tau$ and $V \in \sigma$ such that $x \in U$, $y \in V$ and both U and V are LC -subspaces of X and Y , respectively. By [3, Theorem 2], $U \times V$ is an LC -subspace of the product space $X \times Y$. By Proposition 2.1, $X \times Y$ is a locally LC -space. $\square$

Remark 2.6 We note that the Hausdorff condition can be reduced to the weaker separation property R_1 . Recall that a space (X, τ) is called an R_1 -space if x and y have disjoint neighborhoods whenever $\text{cl}\{x\} \neq \text{cl}\{y\}$. Clearly, a space is Hausdorff if and only if it is T_1 and R_1 .

Question. Does Proposition 2.5 remain true if we drop the requirement that the spaces in question have to be Hausdorff (or R_1)?

Proposition 2.7 *Every locally hereditarily Lindelöf, locally LC -space is discrete.*

Proof. Let (X, τ) be a locally hereditarily Lindelöf and a locally LC -space. We may assume that every point $x \in X$ has an open neighbourhood W that is both hereditarily Lindelöf and an LC -space. But this means that W is an open discrete subspace of (X, τ) . Thus (X, τ) is discrete as well. $\square$

Corollary 2.8 *A locally LC-space is discrete if and only if it is locally finite. $\square$*

Proposition 2.9 *Every locally LC-space is a T_1 -space.*

Proof. Assume that (X, τ) is a locally LC-space and let $x \in X$. For every $y \neq x$, there exists $U \in \tau$ such that $y \in U$ and $(U, \tau|U)$ is an LC-space and hence a T_1 -space. Clearly, $y \in U \setminus \{x\} \in \tau$ and $x \notin U$. This shows that X is T_1 . $\square$

Proposition 2.10 *If every LC-subspace of every Lindelöf subset of a topological space (X, τ) is Lindelöf, then X is a locally LC-space if and only if X is an LC-space.*

Proof. Assume that X is a locally LC-space. Let $A \subseteq X$ be Lindelöf and let $x \notin A$. Since X is an locally LC-space, there exists $U \in \tau$ such that $x \in U$ and $(U, \tau|U)$ is an LC-space. Since every subspace of an LC-space is an LC-space, $U \cap A$ is an LC-space. By assumption, $U \cap A$ is Lindelöf and hence closed in $(U, \tau|U)$. Thus, $U \setminus A$ is open in (X, τ) , contains x and is disjoint from A . This shows that A is closed and consequently X is an LC-space. $\square$

Proposition 2.11 *Open (and hence also closed) bijective images of locally LC-spaces are locally LC-spaces.*

Proof. Let $f: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be open and bijective and let (X, τ) be a locally LC-space. Let $y \in Y$. Choose $x \in X$ such that $f(x) = y$. Since (X, τ) is a locally LC-space, then there exists $U \in \tau$ such that $x \in U$ and $(U, \tau|U)$ is an LC-space. Since f is open, then $f(U)$ is an open neighborhood of y in (Y, σ) . Since open, bijective images of LC-spaces are also LC-spaces, then $(f(U), \sigma|f(U))$ is an LC-subspace of (Y, σ) . By Proposition 2.1, (Y, σ) is a locally LC-space. $\square$

Corollary 2.12 *The property ‘locally LC-space’ is a topological property. $\square$*

References

- [1] D. Cameron, Maximal and minimal topologies, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **160** (1971), 229–248.
- [2] P. Bankston, The total negation of a topological property, *Illinois J. Math.*, **23** (1979) 241–252.
- [3] J. Dontchev and M. Ganster, On the product of LC -spaces, *Questions Answers Gen. Topology*, **15** (1) (1997), 71–74.
- [4] J. Dontchev, M. Ganster and A. Kanibir, On some generalizations of LC -spaces, preprint.
- [5] M. Ganster and D. Janković, On spaces whose Lindelöf subsets are closed, *Questions Answers Gen. Topology*, **7** (1989), 141–148.
- [6] M. Ganster, A. Kanibir and I.L. Reilly, Two examples in topology, preprint.
- [7] D.B. Gauld, M. Mršević, I.L. Reilly and M.K. Vamanamurthy, Co-Lindelöf topologies and l -continuous functions, *Glasnik Mat.*, **19** (39) (1984), 297–308.
- [8] H.Z. Hdeib and C.M. Pareek, On spaces in which Lindelöf sets are closed, *Questions Answers Gen. Topology*, **4** (1986), 3–13.
- [9] T.K. Mukherji and M. Sarkar, On a class of almost discrete spaces, *Mat. Vesnik*, (3) (16) (**31**) (1979), 459–474.
- [10] A.K. Misra, A topological view of P -spaces, *Gen. Top. Appl.*, **2** (1972), 349–362.
- [11] A. Wilansky, Between T_1 and T_2 , *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **74** (1967), 261–266.

Department of Mathematics
PL 4, Yliopistonkatu 5
University of Helsinki
00014 Helsinki
Finland
e-mail: dontchev@cc.helsinki.fi

Department of Mathematics
Graz University of Technology
Steyrergasse 30
A-8010 Graz
Austria
e-mail: ganster@weyl.math.tu-graz.ac.at

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science
Hacettepe University
06532 Beytepe/Ankara
Turkey
e-mail: kanibir@eti.cc.hun.edu.tr